

DIG
5/14/91

SPECIAL EDITION

Institutional Advancement, Page 2

OUTLOOK

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER FOR FACULTY AND STAFF AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

APRIL 5, 1991

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 24

UPUB F7.002

Campus Senate to Act on Governance Report



The Campus Senate will consider endorsement of the Report of the Task Forces on Campus Governance at its meeting at 3:30 p.m. on April 11 in Room 0126, Reckord Armory.

The report results from a process begun by President William E. Kirwan with the appointment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance, chaired by Robert Birnbaum, in September 1989. The Birnbaum Committee visited numerous campuses throughout the country investigating campus governance structures, conducted hearings on the College Park campus, and submitted its report to Kirwan in February 1990. Kirwan forwarded the report to the Senate, and the Senate Executive Committee charged two task forces with preparing the Birnbaum Report for consideration by the Senate. After additional hearings, the task forces issued the following report, which will be considered by the Senate.

The Senate invites comments to your Campus Senate representative. Campus Senate meetings are open to all members of the campus community. Members of the campus community who wish to address the Senate on this or any other matter should speak with their representative, and have him or her request the permission of the Senate.

Other items on the Campus Senate agenda for the April 11 meeting include action on an amendment to the Code of Academic Integrity and information reports on the use of SATs in admission and the question of D grades in majors. Shalia Aery, Secretary of the Maryland Higher Education Commission, is scheduled to address the meeting.

The following is the complete text of the report to be discussed.

I. DESCRIPTION OF TASK FORCES' WORK

To enable the University of Maryland at College Park to develop a more effective system of faculty governance, the Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance, chaired by Robert Birnbaum, was established in September 1989 by President Kirwan, in cooperation with the Senate Executive Committee,

to review the role of the faculty in College Park governance and compare it with the role of faculty in governance at other leading institutions. After considerable deliberation including visits to several universities, a poll of the faculty, and public hearings, the Ad Hoc Committee submitted its report on February 28, 1990. That report is included as an appendix to this review.

The Executive Committee of the Senate decided during the summer of 1990 to facilitate work toward the implementation of the report by appointing two task forces, one to review recommendations 3-11, another to review recommendations 12-33. The first two recommendations were not included in the charge to either of the task forces, but their substance, converting the existing Campus Senate to a Faculty Senate or increasing faculty representation on the Campus Senate, was the subject of considerable testimony during the task forces' hearings and will be addressed by this report.

The two task forces, chaired by Andrew Wolvin and Ralph Bennett, have studied the recommendations of the Birnbaum Committee. Faculty and administrative reactions have been solicited through correspondence, informal conversations, meetings, and in campus hearings on the issues and suggestions offered in the Birnbaum Report.

The task forces met separately and held separate hearings, but the issues raised during these deliberations invariably touched issues common to the interests of both task forces. So persistent was this congruity that the combination of the two task forces and their recommendations seemed increasingly appropriate and has produced this joint document.

It should be recognized that specific recommendations concerning academic decision-making and administrative review, addressed in the Birnbaum Report, are already in place in university documents approved by the Campus Senate. The "Procedures for the Review of the Performance of the Academic Units and Their Administrators on the College Park Campus of the University of Maryland," developed by a committee chaired by Allen Plotkin in 1973, spells out the procedures for administrative reviews. The "Report of the Senate-Chancellor Task Force on Academic Decision Making," created by a committee chaired by Gerald Miller in 1979, offers detailed procedures to create the structures for effective decision making at all levels on the

campus. Likewise, the Plan for Academic Reorganization, presented by a committee chaired by Andrew Wolvin in 1985, reaffirms the principles stipulated in these earlier reports.

What follows, then, is a legislative report for action by the College Park Campus Senate. The two task forces have joined their study and their proposals to facilitate a thorough look at both the Senate and the non-Senate governance structures, and at the recommendations offered by the Birnbaum committee.

The task forces wish this report to be seen as an effort to render the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee workable and capable of incorporation into the Plan of Organization of the campus and into the life of the campus community.

II. PRINCIPLES

The Ad Hoc Committee listed 17 principles from which its recommendations flowed. The task forces felt that 1) principles, to be clear and to effectively guide a commitment to shared governance, should be few and comprehensive and that 2) several of the principles were so specific and detailed as to be better placed among the recommendations. Accordingly, we offer four principles which we feel should guide shared governance. It will be noted that these principles apply to the overall governance of the campus of which faculty governance is a vital and pre-eminent part.

1. A commitment to develop knowledge and bring the fruits of knowledge into the lives of its students compels a university to construct an academic community which exemplifies free and open participation in the forces that affect the lives of its members. The commitment to shared governance is, thus, central to academic life. In the classroom and in the administration of the university, commitment to principles of meaningful participation in governance must be acknowledged by all in the community, taught in its classrooms, facilitated and rewarded by those in positions of responsibility and made a part of the active pursuit of education. To affirm commitments to the breadth of participation, governance must be inclusive, coalescing the broad diversity of the campus community. In short, the campus must commit itself to a climate of informed and active participation in governance by all in its community.

2. Shared governance at the University of Maryland at College Park means governance shared among administration, faculty, staff, and students. Among these, the faculty have a fundamental role in the governance of the institution. The administration is responsible for seeking advice, initiating action, making decisions and implementing policy and for maintaining accountability for its actions. Administrative accountability means active accounting to the other constituents with whom governance is shared on policies recommended by those constituents. The faculty have the responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities related to all aspects of the academic mission of the campus. Staff have a vital role in support of the campus mission and have the responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities. Undergraduate and graduate students have the responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities which have specific impact on their areas of interest.

3. All principles of shared governance should be actively implemented at every administrative level including program, department, college and campus. Shared governance requires establishing a structure parallel to the administrative lines of authority through which faculty, staff and students can participate.

4. Communication is fundamental to shared governance. Formal communication involves policies related to accountability and campus publications. Informal communication requires physical facilities which encourage collegiality and opportunities for contact. A commitment by the administration to shared governance must include allocation of sufficient resources to construct an environment for formal and informal communication that will make informed governance a reality.



III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

1. The establishment and maintenance of a climate supportive of, and encouraging to, participation in governance should be a principal purpose for all members of the campus community.

Discussion: Current campus attitudes and policies tend to discourage participation in shared governance, especially by faculty and staff. Certain administrators view those active in shared governance as "professional politicians," and some faculty members view governance as the responsibility of others. Participation in governance activities is not seen as important in consideration for tenure, promotion, or merit decisions. Staff have described active discouragement of their participation, such as denial

of permission to attend Senate meetings. This negative climate has led to a circular negative perception of participation in shared governance activities at College Park as reflected in the findings of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The task forces feel that participation in shared governance should be seen as a high obligation of citizenship in the campus community. Faculty, especially, should see their role in shared governance as described in these recommendations as constituting a special obligation to participate in shared governance. This obligation to participate should be especially strongly felt by tenured and senior faculty to whom the institution has made a unique, long-term commitment.

The Ad Hoc Committee's Report and these recommendations address structural and procedural reforms of governance at College Park, but none of these ideas will succeed without broad agreement and support for participation in the activities which will make shared governance a reality.

2. The principles of governance should be constituted in Plans of Organization developed and approved by the faculty and implemented by all university academic units.¹

Discussion: It became clear in the process of reviewing the Ad Hoc Committee Report that some faculty members are functioning in units with no clear structure for governance, particularly at the departmental level. It also became clear that the departmental plans of organization are not a formal part of the college and campus plans. Consequently, it is further recommended that:

3. Each unit Plan of Organization should be reviewed and approved at the college level and be attached to a Plan of Organization which should be reviewed and approved at the university level by the Campus Senate for consistency with the principles of governance. All departmental and college plans will be filed with the campus Plan of Organization of the Campus Senate.

Discussion: The process of incorporating all Plans of Organization ultimately with the university plan will ensure that each academic unit within each of the colleges will have an approved Plan of Organization that is recognized as a viable part of the governance of the entire campus.

4. Each Plan of Organization must contain provisions for faculty involvement in all decisions which affect academic matters within the particular unit including, but not limited to, budgets, curriculum, facilities, salaries, appointments, promotion, and tenure.

Discussion: To provide for the necessary structure to involve faculty in governance of a unit, it is important that the precise role of faculty in the critical issues be clearly

spelled out in the document, so that there can be no question as to how shared governance is to be accomplished.

5. The Plans of Organization must clearly establish and delineate the governance structure to accomplish the objectives of participatory decision-making. This structure should include, but should not be limited to: a unit-wide faculty council; a faculty advisory committee to offer guidance to the unit's administrator, composed of both elected and appointed members (where desirable and appropriate to the size of the unit); and the requisite budget, salary, curriculum, facilities, and appointments/promotion/tenure committees. Procedures for the selection of members for these committees shall be a part of each unit's plan of organization. Membership of these committees should include staff and students as appropriate.

Discussion: The specific committee structure will necessarily differ according to the size and mission of the academic unit. It is clear, however, that stipulating the basic committee structure and process in the Plans of Organization will ensure that such a structure is in place for full faculty participation at every level.

6. At the university level, the president and provost should continue to address the state of the campus at an open Campus Senate meeting. The meeting should be widely publicized to offer the opportunity for all members of the campus community to attend.

Discussion: While some campuses do have faculty assemblies, the Task Force believes that the present Campus Senate meeting structure can serve this same useful purpose without requiring additional meetings and arrangements. The key to setting up Special Orders of the Day for campus-wide discussion, however, is to publicize the meeting widely and to allow opportunity for a question/answer session with the administrators.

7. The university president (and other unit administrators) should conduct periodic informal meetings with various groups to enhance familiarity with campus issues and climate.

Discussion: The task forces were persuaded that the Ad Hoc Committee Report's recommendation for a presidential Faculty Advisory Committee was problematic and essentially duplicates the current practice of breakfast meetings with the Campus Senate Executive Committee. Further, it was noted by several faculty members that former Chancellor Gluckstern's practice of inviting various faculty members for informal conversations about the campus served a similar purpose, allowing the administrator to gauge campus sentiment and to stay in touch with the campus faculty, staff, and students.

8. The initial appointment to an administrative position of chair or

¹Academic Unit refers to all levels including departments, programs, centers, institutes, schools, colleges, and campus-wide administration.

dean should be for a five-year term. A chair or dean may be appointed to a second term of up to five years. Appointment beyond ten years shall be regarded as unusual and shall require a full review and rationale.

Discussion: The requirement for a review at the end of five years is reasonable, and reappointment or retention for one to five additional years offers flexibility. At ten years, any further extension would require careful scrutiny and significantly greater justification.

9. All administrators, including the chief administrative officer and those assistant and associate administrators in a unit, should receive periodic performance reviews which include input from the faculty, staff, and students in the administrator's unit.

Discussion: It became apparent to the task force that faculty members believe that there is little or no sense of two-way accountability in the present governance structure. While faculty performance is accountable to the key administrators, there appears to be little accountability of administrators to those they administer. Thus, periodic reviews of all campus administrators should be established as both policy and procedure.

10. Administrators should be expected to provide leadership as well as management of a unit.

Discussion: It is clear from both the Ad Hoc Committee Report and the task forces' hearings that some faculty concerns about governance on this campus stemmed from dissatisfaction with present administrative leadership in certain units. The task forces urge that chief administrative officers develop job descriptions that provide for academic leadership as well as day-to-day management of unit functions.

11. Shared governance should be characterized by two-way information flow between committees and the bodies or administrators appointing them. The goal of this recommendation is to ensure (1) that committees have sufficient information on which to make reasoned decisions and (2) that administrators respond in writing to the committee recommendations, offering an indication (and rationale) as to acceptance or rejection of the recommendations. When committees request specific information, committee members should be appraised of the disposition and results of these requests.

Discussion: Consultation without full and independent access to information becomes ineffective and meaningless. Among the powers of those who share governance must be the power to be provided, as a matter of courtesy and by specific request, information concerning the issues facing the unit. Following consultation, fully effective shared governance requires

that administrators respond to recommendations of consulting committees, acknowledging their acceptance or non-acceptance of the recommendations and providing reasons for this judgement. Testimony before the task forces indicated that current university practice offers too little two-way communication between committees and the persons to whom they report. Information is often provided to committees on a "need to know" basis. Too often, those participating in governance feel that their hard work receives little or no response, diminishing interest in serving on committees.

12. The College Park campus must develop a more responsive and responsible communication climate. The campus communication climate can be enhanced through specific recommendations:

Discussion: The focus of much faculty reaction to the Ad Hoc Committee Report centered on the need for creating a strong climate of communication that will further the principles and goals of shared governance. Faculty dissatisfaction with the present communication process was expressed at every unit level.

A. Outlook should be enhanced and expanded to incorporate more coverage of Campus Senate meetings, College meetings, APAC, major committees, etc.

Discussion: It is clear that the campus should not create new, additional newsletters and publications. Rather, the excellent format of Outlook can serve as the basis for expanded coverage.

B. A meeting place should be created where faculty can truly come together both formally and informally to talk with each other.

Discussion: Several of our respondents noted the serious lack of any central space for faculty to interact. The present location of the Campus Senate in the Armory basement is perceived to be problematic; the Rossborough does not adequately meet our informal needs; and the lack of a central space mitigates against much faculty communication.

C. The administration should develop an effective system for the timely publication of general campus information.

Discussion: The publication of campus-wide information is uneven in its timing and its coverage. There is no unified campus calendar; the campus telephone directory has recently appeared after nearly half of the year has passed; there is no single summary of the status of committee activity on campus. This leads to general ignorance of even the most basic information, and prevents informed participation in shared governance.

13. Policies relating to the basic organization of the university should be reviewed, brought up

to date and implemented according to the principles of shared governance.

Discussion: Two examples illustrate this problem. The 1985 reorganization of the College Park mandated a review of the structure it produced within five years; this review should be undertaken. The establishment of the college/dean system was based on the understanding that the entire structure would be reviewed in a timely fashion to ensure that the principles on which it was based (e.g. "strong" deans as academic leaders; closer access of colleges to the decision making in Academic Affairs; closer relationship of faculty in individual units to the college decision-making process; forceful articulation of individual unit needs and response to those needs via the college deans) are indeed functioning.

The policy concerning the elimination of academic units, "Reduction, Consolidation, Transfer, or Discontinuance of Programs and Termination of Faculty Positions During a Financial Emergency," was sent from the Senate to the administration in April, 1989. The policy was never implemented and current discussions of the elimination of academic units are being conducted without benefit of this policy.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE CAMPUS SENATE

14. The resources necessary for the operation of the Campus Senate in full implementation of the recommendations following should be provided by administration at all levels.

Discussion: While many of the recommendations of this Joint Task Force Report can be implemented as improved governance within the units with no great additional cost, the recommendations related to the Senate will require resources not now allocated. At the unit level, this will include administrative support for participation in Senate and campus committee activity. At the campus level, this may include release time and summer compensation for the Senate chair and chair-elect, staff support for the Subcommittee on Committees and the Senate Committees, and resources to improve communications within the campus community regarding governance.

The Senate has operated in extreme poverty from its inception. Only the existence of a diligent and committed staff willing to work far beyond their assigned tasks has made the Senate what it is today. What it is today, while impressive, falls short in many areas according to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance, and will require additional resources to implement the recommendations of this report. Effective governance will require such resources; none of these recommendations can reasonably be added to the Senate's already over-burdened staff without such additional support.

15. The Plan of Organization Review Committee should formalize a faculty caucus within the Campus Senate structure and define issues for which the faculty have primary responsibility.

Discussion: The Ad Hoc Committee Report contains several recommendations relating to campus-wide representative faculty groups. While such groups have historically experienced difficulty in stimulating interest, the task forces believe that there is merit to these ideas, and recommends that a caucus of faculty senators could serve this purpose. The importance of such a group is underscored by recent University of Maryland System governance procedures which require campus delegates to system- and state-wide entities. The proposed caucus will be an appropriate forum from which to elect such representatives.

16. The Senate Executive Committee should be reorganized to become a senior advisory panel to the administration, and the chief agency for implementing and overseeing the operations of shared governance on the College Park campus, including enhancement of the Campus and Senate Committee structures and facilitation of Senate consideration of policy issues.

A. Membership on the Executive Committee should include both members of the Senate and no more than five faculty members who are not members of the Senate. Members should be selected by the Campus Senate from slates provided by the Subcommittee on Committees. Non-senate members of the Executive Committee shall be exempt from service on Executive Committee subcommittees.

B. A subcommittee of the Executive Committee should be established called the Subcommittee on Committees with principal responsibility for the Campus and Senate committees. The subcommittee shall be chaired by the Chair-Elect of the Senate. Its responsibilities will include identification of individuals for service on Campus and Senate committees based on matches between the tasks of the various committees and the skills and experience of the candidates, oversight of operations, and ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of committees.

C. A subcommittee of the Executive Committee should be established called the Subcommittee on the Agenda. The subcommittee shall be chaired by the Chair of the Senate. The subcommittee's responsibilities shall include preparing the Senate's meeting agendas, defining rules to govern debate of the Senate's business, tracking Senate business through Senate committees, and review of the content of such aspects of the Senate's business as it may deem appropriate.

Discussion: It is envisioned that the Executive Committee be available as a whole or in part for consultation with the administration and that it be seen as a resource for the administration. The Ad Hoc Committee Report observes that eminent members of the faculty who may not wish to devote the time required for day-to-day work in governance but whose counsel is valuable to the campus could be encouraged to serve on several kinds of advisory committees. The Task Forces believe that this purpose can be served by opening membership on the Executive Committee to a limited number of non-senate members who would be exempt from subcommittee work.

17. The campus and senate committee structure should be enhanced as the primary vehicle for involvement by the campus community in campus-wide governance.

Discussion: The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance made several recommendations about the operation of the Campus Senate. The task forces agree with these recommendations and suggest these specific changes to improve continuity in the execution of Campus Senate business.

A. The chair-elect of the Senate should assume primary administrative responsibility for the operation of the committee structure.

B. The ability of the Senate office to provide support for committee work should be enhanced. This enhancement shall include the hiring of an additional staff member for the office with primary responsibility to support committee work. A system for maintenance of committee records in the Senate office should be instituted. Physical facilities to provide meeting space for committees and to facilitate use of the Senate office for support of committee work should be provided.

C. The terms of members of Senate committees should be extended to two years to ensure greater continuity in the work of the committees. Half the members of the committees shall be appointed each year.

D. Consultative relationships between appropriate administrators and corresponding Senate committees should be defined.

E. Campus and Senate committees should receive a written charge formulated in consultation with the appropriate administrator and the Senate Executive Committee.

18. The Senate Bylaws should define specific responsibilities for senators to promote shared governance. A principal responsibility of each Campus senator shall be to seek opinions and communicate the actions of the Senate to his or her constituents. The senator's unit should provide administrative cooperation in this effort. Another principal responsibility

of each Campus senator shall be the identification and recruitment of candidates for campus and Senate committees.

19. The Senate should revise its calendar to facilitate year round participation in governance. Such revisions should include: chair election date in March, committee assignments in April, and two year non-coterminous terms for members of standing or continuing committees.

20. The Senate should develop specific improvements in procedures to facilitate meaningful Senate debate. In preparing the agenda, the Subcommittee on the Agenda of the Executive Committee should be given the power in preparing the agenda to limit the length of time devoted to specific items while preserving the right of the Senate in session to extend the limit. The Senate should actively manage debate by invoking rules restricting the length of speeches and the number of time speakers can address the Senate on a single issue.

Discussion: Parliamentary procedure and the Campus Senate Bylaws contain the tools to make the Campus Senate's debate more efficient. This recommendation is meant to encourage the use of those tools.

21. The Senate should improve its ability to monitor implementation of Senate policy actions. All Senate policy reports should contain implementation procedures including an effective date, the Senate or administrative official responsible for implementation, and a schedule for reports from the official on implementation.

22. A Transition Committee on Implementation should be formed and charged in so far as possible according to these recommendations; it will report periodically to the Campus Senate Executive Committee and to the president regarding the status of implementation of the recommendations. The Transition Committee on Implementation should be disbanded at such time as the Executive Committee of the Campus Senate is reconstituted according to these recommendations and is able to act accordingly.

Discussion: The implementation of these recommendations can form a paradigm of the recommendations themselves and the principles which accompany them. Implementation should be seen as an effort involving all elements of the campus community.

These recommendations, once acted on by the Campus Senate, will constitute recommended university policy relative to campus governance. In accordance with Recommendation 21, this policy should be accompanied by a schedule for implementation along with the identities of administrators and Campus Senate officials who will be responsible for its implementation.

Appendix

Strengthening a Partnership: Shared Governance at the University of Maryland at College Park. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Faculty Governance. Submitted to William E. Kirwan, President, University of Maryland at College Park on February 28, 1990.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee:
Robert Birnbaum (chair),
Monique Clague, Jane E. Clark,
the late Richard T. Farrell,
Raymond L. Johnson, Earlean
M. McCarrick, Phyllis B. Moser-
Veillon, Alan Pasch, Mahlon
Straszheim

Members of the Campus Governance Task Force:
Andrew Wolvin (chair), Theresa
Colletti, Marvin Breslow, Jacob
Goldhaber, Judith Hallett,
Martin Johnson

Members of the Senate Committees and Procedures Task Force:
Ralph Bennett (chair), Janet
Hunt, Jean Hebel, Larry
Lauer, Jay Thomas, James
Klumpp, Kathleen Smith